8th September 1928] [Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao]

ex-Minister and the methods likely to be adopted by the present Minister if this motion is agreed to are particularly wrong. I wish the present Development Minister withdraws the present demand and comes before the House again with a better scheme."

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" Sir, I have listened to the debates with great care. I can only say that my predecessor in office who knew the importance of cottage industries selected the best man to survey the present situation of the industries, and he has been in charge of the work since. The hon. Member Mr. Tulasiram says that this officer goes to the Members of the Legislative Council and asks them for information. He was instructed as far as possible to meet the Members of the Legislative Council and be in touch with them. If that is taken as a disqualification, he need not see them hereafter. He does it simply to get information. Perhaps he is a quiet man and is not of a talkative nature which should not be taken as a disqualification. I heard Mr. Moidu, President, District Board, Malabar, say that he was one of the most sincere officers and that he was able to give him much information in Malabar. Anyhow, Sir, the work has been undertaken and has to be finished. We shall then have a report for the whole Presidency to consider and see how the cottage industries can be improved." 1-30 p.m.

The question that Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,500 under Grant XXVI—Industries—Transferred was put to the House and carried ; and the grant made.

The House then rose for lunch.

(After lunch 2-30 p.m.)

V

REFERENCE TO THE PROCEEDINGS ON SIMON COMMITTEE MOTION.

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" Mr. President, Sir, with your permission, I should like to make one or two observations in connection with the proceedings of the House on Tuesday last. I feel it my duty on behalf of my party to give expression to the feeling that has been agitating the members of my party regarding the occurrences of 3rd and 4th instant. The members of my party feel that the expeditiousness with which the motions connected with the formation of the Simon Committee were dealt with did not afford enough opportunity for a full expression of opinion on such a momentous question. The motion for closure was moved and allowed even before one of the Deputy Leaders has finished his speech. More particularly, Sir, the extension of the sitting of this House beyond the usual hour, though not agreed to on invitation, is viewed as a deprivation of the privileges of the Opposition. Anxious as I am that there should be no misunderstanding between the Chair and the Members of the House, I place this information regarding the existence of such a feeling before you to avoid further misunderstanding."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has just referred to the proceedings of this Council of the 3rd and 4th. His first point was with reference to the expeditiousness with which the proceedings were carried. As far as my recollection goes the whole of the 3rd was devoted to the question of the President giving his consent or not and to the question of the point of order."

[8th September 1928

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"I am sorry it was only the 4th."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. the Leader of the Opposition referred to the 3rd. Regarding the 4th, if the House remembers aright, after the main motion had been put to the House for discussion, there was at first a dilatory motion in the Parliamentary parlance on the part of Mr. Saldanha who moved that the motion be postponed till a certain event had happened. If I remember correctly, more than five or six speakers had their say on the motion and then closure was moved and accepted by the House. After Mr. Saldanha's motion was disposed of, Mr. Siva Rao's amendment was taken into consideration and an equal number of speakers on both sides of the House took part in the debate and then closure was moved. Afterwards Mr. Siva Rao's amendment was accepted by the House. Subsequently, there was an amendment of Mr. Saldanha, which was not even seconded. Then the amended resolution was open for the discussion of the House. At that stage the Leader of the Opposition moved a dilatory motion under Standing Order 34. If I remember well, he occupied more than ten minutes on that motion, and after that it was seconded by one of the Deputy Leaders, Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, who also occupied more than ten minutes. My idea is that a motion, under Standing Order 34 is ordinarily not dilated upon for such a long time. I have got a fairly long experience of the House and motions under Standing Order 34 are not generally allowed to be discussed for long periods. To my mind there has been no instance when motions of this kind were debated upon for a longer period. Just before Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar closed his speech, closure was again applied for. I have often held that a closure motion can be made even in the middle of a speech. That follows from the wording of Standing Order 33. It is for the House to change the wording of the standing order if it thinks that it is unsatisfactory. I agree that it is not a thing to be generally encouraged; but when once the Speaker comes to the conclusion that it is a dilatory motion, he has to use his discretion and if he thinks there has been reasonable debate, he has to accept the closure and allow the House to judge.

2-45 p.m. "Regarding the continuance of the sitting beyond 5 p.m., according to the standing orders as they are, there is no time limit placed as to when the Council should adjourn. On a former occasion, when a similar contingency arose, I even advised Members of the Opposition to take steps to fix a rigid rule as to when it should adjourn. There are many instances within my recollection when a sitting of the House was continued after 5 o'clock. I can believe that it may be a matter of inconvenience to some of the Members to remain in Council after 5 p.m. on account of their other engagements. But I suggest that it is necessary either to have a rigid rule or to adopt the practice of the House of Commons, where just before the beginning of each sitting, the Leader of the House or the Leader of the Opposition if he considers that a particular subject requires to be disposed of on that very day, moves for the suspension of the standing order regarding the hours of sitting and for the prolongation of the sitting until such time as he may think that the discussion of the subject will require. Thus in the House of Commons the intentions of the House have to be carried out, and it has control over its sittings. As long as our standing orders

8th September 1928] [The hon. the President]

remain as they are, I have to use my discretion to the best of my lights; and if the Opposition feels that certain restrictions are necessary, I hope they will take the necessary steps to amend the standing orders."

VI

RESOLUTION UNDER SECTION 8 OF THE COTTON TRANSPORT ACT, 1923.

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move the following resolution, viz.,—

'*This Council recommends to the Government that the revised notification*[a] *and rules submitted to the Council for approval under section* 8 *of the Cotton Transport Act*, 1923 (*III of* 1923), *as amended by the Cotton Transport (Amendment) Act*, 1925 (*XXXIV of* 1925), *be issued by the Local Government in the form in which they have been so submitted.*'

"Though it is perhaps not necessary to explain the proposals before the House, I shall briefly advert to the past history of this measure in this Presidency. As the hon. Members are aware, the Cotton Transport Act was passed by the Indian Legislature in 1923 with the main object of maintaining and improving the quality of the cotton grown in certain areas. To attain this object, the measure enables the Local Government to prohibit, by notification, the import of cotton into that area except under a licence. No notification can issue unless it has been approved by a resolution of the Council. The notification and the rules framed under the Act by the Government of Madras were first placed before the Council in August 1925 and passed by it. According to the notification and rules then passed, the Act was extended to Madras and made applicable to three protected areas:—

"(1) The northern and western area consisting of the Ceded districts."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—"The hon. Minister is reading his speech wholesale."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"After hearing this morning the hon. the Chief Minister, an English University man, and our own ex-Minister, a graduate of our University, who referred to manuscript speeches, I don't think I will be justified in restraining Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar." (Laughter.)

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR:—"It is purely technical and has to be explained with notes."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I therefore request you to kindly remove the ban on manuscript speeches?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"When I allowed Sir A. P. Patro and the hon. the Chief Minister this morning to resort to manuscript eloquence, I need not say that I have practically removed the ban on manuscript speeches."

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"As a matter of personal explanation, I beg to point out to you, Sir, that even in the House of Commons responsible Ministers of the Crown do read from manuscript especially when it concerns matters of policy or matters of finance."

---

a Printed as Appendix XIII at pages 595–606 infra.